

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19-24 were pending in this application. All claims were rejected. Claims 1, 8, and 19 were amended herein. Claims 9, 10, 18, and 25-27 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

I. Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "loads a probe" as claimed in claims 1, 8, and 17. The applicants do not agree with the objection. More specifically, the application at page 12, lines 9-18 describe loading the probe as claimed in claim 1. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the applicant has changed the "probe" to "program." Loading a program is also described in page 12, lines 9-18.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19-24 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. According to the office action, the specification does not teach a probe. As set forth above, the term probe has been changed to program. Both of these terms are described at page 12, lines 9-18 in addition to other areas of the specification.

Based on the foregoing, the applicants contend that the rejections have been overcome.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19-24 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-8, 11-17, and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Groath (U.S. 6,571,285).

CLAIM 1

The office action states that Groath discloses loading a probe, which is software for monitoring. However, the office action does not state where in Groath an electronic device loads a probe (or program) into another device as claimed in the independent claims. The applicant has reviewed Groath, but has not found this element. The applicant notes that Groath has 37 drawing sheets and 180 columns of text. Based on the extent of Groath, the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner specifically point out where in Groath the elements of the claims are disclosed.

In the absence of such specificity, the applicants contend that Groath does not disclose loading a program as claimed in the independent claims. Accordingly, Groath cannot anticipate claim 1.

CLAIMS 2-7

Claims 2-7 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 8

The applicant reiterates the rebuttal to the rejection of claim 1 into this rebuttal. The office action does not state where "loading a program" as claimed in claim 8 is disclosed in Groath.

In the absence of such specificity, the applicants contend that Groath does not disclose loading a program as claimed in the independent claims. Accordingly, Groath cannot anticipate claim 8.

CLAIMS 11-16

Claims 11-16 are dependent on claim 8 and are allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

CLAIM 17

The applicant reiterates the rebuttal to the rejections of claims 1 and 8 into this rebuttal. The office action does not state where "loading a program" as claimed in claim 17 is disclosed in Groath.

In the absence of such specificity, the applicants contend that Groath does not disclose loading a program as claimed in the independent claims. Accordingly, Groath cannot anticipate claim 17.

CLAIMS 19-24

Claims 19-24 are dependent on claim 17 and are allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

June 21, 2005

By: *Robert Nelson*
Robert Nelson
Registration No. 37,898
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 298-9888